

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended the specification to relocate the brief description with the drawings as suggested by the Examiner. Formal drawings are being submitted herewith.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poolman (US Patent No. 5,887,753) in view of Clapperton et al., (US Patent 6,090,762), hereinafter "Clapperton". Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As mentioned on page 2, line 26 - page 3, line 8 of the present description, the detergent liquid products normally used -in the device of Poolman '753 - are isotropic Newtonian fluids. These have the same viscosity (typically between 0.1 Pa.s and 1 Pa.s) under all conditions, specifically at rest and under shear when they are applied to fabrics during pretreating. The problem -which was identified by the inventors - is that the use of such Newtonian detergent liquid leads to a leakage between the roller ball and the hollow body in the dosing/dispensing device of Poolman '753. The aim of the present invention is to solve this problem and to obtain a leakage-free device. It was surprisingly found that this problem could be solved by providing a dosing and dispensing device according to claim 1 and a process for pretreating and washing fabric according to claim 10, whereby the liquid detergent composition is a non-Newtonian fluid as specified in claim 1. The very high viscosity of this non-Newtonian detergent liquid in rest and its low viscosity under shear stress during application to the fabrics ensures respectively a leak-free system as well as easy application. The use of such non-Newtonian detergent liquid brings clearly a special effect compared to the use of a normally Newtonian detergent liquid.

Motivation to combine must come from the prior art. It is respectfully submitted that neither Poolman nor Clapperton provide any motivation to combine

these two references. It is not seen what in the teachings of Poolman and Clapperton would have led one of ordinary skill in the art, who has not had the benefit of hindsight afforded by the present disclosure to combine the references in the manner such as to obtain the present invention.

Poolman does not contain any suggestion or pointer in the direction of Clapperton '762. Furthermore, Clapperton is silent about the specific viscosity at rest and the specific viscosity under shear. Consequently, when confronted with the problem addressed by the present invention and knowing the cited prior art the one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been inclined to combine the teachings of Poolman and Clapperton so as to arrive at the subject matter of the present patent application, without exercising inventive skill.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the obviousness rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn and the application be allowed to issue.

If a telephone conversation would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of the present application, applicants' undersigned attorney invites the Examiner to telephone at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Rimma Mitelman", written over a horizontal line.

Rimma Mitelman
Registration No. 34,396
Attorney for Applicant(s)

RM/sa
(201) 894-2671